Appeal: 09-7974 Doc: 10 Filed: 07/22/2010 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-7974

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JERMAINE WILSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:03-cr-00321-AW-17; 8:09-cv-01340-AW)

Submitted: June 29, 2010 Decided: July 22, 2010

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and KING and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jermaine Wilson, Appellant Pro Se. Stuart A. Berman, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jermaine Wilson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying as untimely his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Wilson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

Appeal: 09-7974 Doc: 10 Filed: 07/22/2010 Pg: 3 of 3

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED